arXiv:1702.02143v1 [astro-ph.CO] 7 Feb 2017

Echo for interaction in the dark sector

Suresh Kumar[1,*] and Rafael C. Nunes[2,†]

[1]Department of Mathematics, BITS Pilani, Pilani Campus, Rajasthan-333031,India
[2]Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora, 36036-330, Juiz de Fora, MG, Brazil

We investigate the observational constraints on an interacting vacuum energy scenario with two different neutrino schemes (with and without a sterile neutrino) using the most recent data from CMB temperature and polarization anisotropy, baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO), type Ia supernovae from JLA sample, structure growth inferred from cluster counts, and Hubble parameter measurements. We find that inclusion of the galaxy clusters data with the minimal data combination CMB + BAO + JLA suggests an interaction in the dark sector, implying the decay of dark matter particles into dark energy, since the constraints obtained by including the galaxy clusters data yield a non-null and negative coupling parameter between the dark components at 99% confidence level. The model is found to alleviate the current tensions on the parameters H_0 and σ_8.

PACS numbers: 95.35.+d; 95.36.+x; 14.60.Pq; 98.80.Es

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the discovery that our Universe is in a current stage of accelerated expansion [1, 2], the inclusion of an exotic energy component with negative pressure, dubbed as dark energy (DE), in the energy budget of the Universe is necessary to explain the observations. A cosmological model with cold dark matter (CDM) and DE mimicked by a positive cosmological constant Λ, the so-called ΛCDM model, is considered as the standard cosmological model for its ability to fit the observational data with great precision. A large amount of data, pouring in from different physical origins, have been measured with good precision to unveil the dynamics/mysteries of the Universe in the last decade or so. Some data sets are found in tension with others within the framework of the ΛCDM model (see[3–7]), which could be an indication of new physics beyond ΛCDM model or may be due to some systematic effects on the data. Also, the cosmological constant suffers from some theoretical problems [8–11], which motivated the researchers to propose new models of DE, or alternative mechanisms that can explain the observational data without the need for DE, such as modified gravity models. Cosmological models, where dark matter (DM) and DE interact throughout the evolution history of the Universe, have received considerable attention of the researchers in the recent past in order to solve/assuage the problem of the cosmic coincidence as well as the problem of the cosmological constant (for the case where DM interacts with vacuum energy). See [12, 13] for general review. It has recently been shown that the current observational data can favor the late-time interaction in the dark sector [14–21].

On the other hand, physical experiments from solar, atmospheric, reactor and accelerator neutrino beams have proved the existence of neutrino oscillations (see [22] and references therein for review and [23, 24] for current experimental status). The phenomenon of neutrino oscillations implies directly a non-zero neutrino mass, once the neutrino oscillations depend only on the mass difference between the three species predicted by the standard model of particle physics. Non-standard neutrinos, like the sterile massive neutrinos, are predicted in a natural extension of the standard model of elementary particles. Sterile neutrinos at the eV mass scale, can explain the anomalies found in some short-baseline neutrino oscillation experiments from the reactor antineutrino anomaly, the Gallium neutrino anomaly, and LSND experiments (see [25–27] for review). These experiments require the existence of light sterile neutrinos.

Massive neutrinos play an important role on cosmological scales, with direct implications on Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) temperature and polarization anisotropy, large scale structure, nuclear abundances produced by big bang nucleosynthesis, and in some other cosmological sources (see [28–30] for review, Planck collaboration paper [31], and forecast from CORE space mission [32] for observational constraints). Recently, cosmological models with massive neutrinos have been studied to reconcile the tension between local and global determinations of the Hubble constant [33–37]. The presence of massive neutrinos in cosmological models is useful to investigate the accuracy and robustness of a given scenario. The cosmological effects of light sterile neutrinos are investigated in different contexts [38–43]

In this paper, we are motivated to investigate a coupled DE scenario, where vacuum energy interacts with DM, by considering neutrinos scheme with sum of the active neutrino masses ($\sum m_\nu$) and the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom ($N_{\rm eff}$) as free quantities. In addition, we consider the models with one non-standard neutrino (sterile neutrino) beyond the three species predicted by the standard model, the so-called (3 + 1) models. We study observational constraints on the models by using the most recent data from CMB temperature and polarization anisotropy, baryon acoustic oscillations, type Ia supernovae from JLA sample, galaxy clusters,

*Electronic address: suresh.kumar@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in
†Electronic address: rafadcnunes@gmail.com

and Hubble parameter measurements. Our main result is that the coupling parameter of the dark sector is observed to be non-zero up to 99% confidence level (CL).

Rest of the paper is structured as follows: The interacting vacuum energy scenario is introduced in the following Section II while different models of neutrinos with the interacting as well as non-interacting vacuum energy scenario are described in Section III. The observational constraints from various recent data sets on the models under consideration are obtained and discussed in detail in Section IV. The conclusions of the study are summarized in the final section.

II. INTERACTION IN THE DARK SECTOR

We consider a spatially-flat Friedmann-Robertson-Walker Universe, with the Friedmann equation given by

$$3H^2 = 8\pi G(\rho_\gamma + \rho_\nu + \rho_{\rm b} + \rho_{\rm dm} + \rho_{\rm de}), \qquad (1)$$

where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter. Further ρ_γ, ρ_ν, $\rho_{\rm b}$, $\rho_{\rm dm}$, and $\rho_{\rm de}$ stand for the energy densities of photons, massive neutrinos, baryons, cold DM and DE, respectively.

We assume that DM and DE interact via the coupling function Q given by

$$\dot{\rho}_{\rm dm} + 3H\rho_{\rm dm} = -\dot{\rho}_{\rm de} - 3H\rho_{\rm de}(1 + w_{\rm de}) = Q. \qquad (2)$$

For $Q > 0$, the energy flow takes place from DE to DM, otherwise the energy flows from DM to DE. The parameter $w_{\rm de}$ is the equation of state of the DE and in general can be constant or variable. In order to avoid many free parameters, we consider the simplest case $w_{\rm de} = -1$, i.e., an interacting vacuum energy scenario. In what follows, we refer this model to as IVCDM model. For the sake of comparison, we shall also consider the non-interacting vacuum energy case ($\delta = 0$), i.e., the ΛCDM model.

Recent studies of interacting vacuum cosmologies have focused on models with general interaction term given by $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm dm}$ or $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm de}$, where δ is a constant and dimensionless parameter that characterizes the interaction between DM and DE. Both classes have been investigated from different perspectives [44–47]. For instance, in[48], we investigated the interaction in dark sector given by the coupling function $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm dm}$. We noted that this coupling function may suffer from instability in the dark sector perturbations at early times (the curvature perturbations may blow up on super Hubble scales), and to avoid such problems we should have $\delta < 10^{-2}$. On the other hand, it is known that $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm de}$ does not present these problems [49], and that the coupling parameter δ can admit much larger values. Once we consider data from perturbative origin in our analysis, the choice $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm de}$ offers a greater range of security/freedom over the coupling parameter, and thus allows this parameter to be constrained within a larger prior range. For instance, the authors in [14] used this coupling function to show that a general late-time interaction between cold DM and vacuum energy is favoured by current cosmological datasets. Therefore, in the present study, we use the coupling function given by $Q = \delta H\rho_{\rm de}$. Once the coupling function Q has been defined, the background evolution of the dark components can be obtained from eq. (2). Here, we adopt the synchronous gauge for the evolution of the scalar mode perturbations of the dark components as in [50, 51], or more explicitly the eqs. (6) - (9) of [48]. The baryons, photons and massive neutrinos are conserved independently, and the perturbation equations follow the standard evolution as described in [52].

III. THE MODELS

On the basis of neutrinos, we consider the following models in our study.

✓ We consider the interacting and non-interacting vacuum energy scenarios possessing neutrinos scheme with sum of the active neutrino masses ($\sum m_\nu$) and the effective number of relativistic degrees of freedom ($N_{\rm eff}$) as free quantities. In our results, we shall denote these models as νIVCDM and $\nu\Lambda$CDM, respectively. We intend to investigate possible correlation of $N_{\rm eff}$ with the coupling parameter δ, and other parameters of interest. The base parameters set for the νIVCDM model is

$$P = \{100\omega_{\rm b},\, \omega_{\rm dm},\, 100\theta_s,\, \ln 10^{10}A_s,\, n_s,\, \tau_{\rm reio},\, N_{\rm eff},\, \sum m_\nu,\, \delta\}.$$

✓ Following the Planck collaboration, we fix the mass ordering of the active neutrinos to the normal hierarchy with the minimum masses allowed by oscillation experiments, i.e., $\sum m_\nu = 0.06$. As generalization, let us take the mass order, $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ eV and $m_3 = 0.06$ eV. Therefore, the presence of excess mass can be considered from a single additional mass state m_4, which can be related to the sterile neutrino mass, m_{ν_s}. Taking this into account, the mass splitting with relation to the sterile neutrino can be written as $\Delta m_{41} = m_4$. In order to constrain the sterile neutrino mass, the effective number of neutrino species is $N_{\rm eff} = 4.046$, i.e., we consider one species of sterile neutrinos (fully thermalized) beyond the three neutrino species of the standard model, the so-called (3+1) models. We consider the sterile neutrino case with the interacting and non-interacting vacuum energy scenarios, and denote these models as ν_sIVCDM and $\nu_s\Lambda$CDM, respectively. The base parameters set for the ν_sIVCDM model is

$$P = \{100\omega_{\rm b},\, \omega_{\rm dm},\, 100\theta_s,\, \ln 10^{10}A_s,\, n_s,\, \tau_{\rm reio},\, m_{\nu_s},\, \delta\}.$$

IV. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

In order to constrain the models under consideration, we use the following data sets.

CMB: The cosmic microwave background (CMB) data from Planck 2015 comprised of the likelihoods at multipoles $l \geq 30$ using TT, TE and EE power spectra and the low-multipole polarization likelihood at $l \leq 29$. The combination of these data is referred to as Planck TT, TE, EE + lowP in [31]. We also include Planck 2015 CMB lensing power spectrum likelihood [53].

BAO: The baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) measurements from the Six Degree Field Galaxy Survey (6dF) [54], the Main Galaxy Sample of Data Release 7 of Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS-MGS) [55], the LOWZ and CMASS galaxy samples of the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS-LOWZ and BOSS-CMASS, respectively) [56], and the distribution of the LymanForest in BOSS (BOSS-Ly) [57]. These data points are summarized in table I of [47].

JLA: The latest "joint light curves" (JLA) sample [58], comprised of 740 type Ia supernovae in the redshift range $z \in [0.01, 1.30]$.

CC+H_0: The cosmic chronometers (CC) data set comprising of 30 measurements spanned in the redshift range $0 < z < 2$, recently compiled in [59]. We also use the recently measured new local value of Hubble constant given by $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1} as reported in [36].

GC: The measurements from the abundance of galaxy clusters (GC) offer a powerful probe of the growth of cosmic structures. We use the measurements from the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect measured by Planck [60] and the constraints derived by CFHTLenS [61].

We modified the publicly available CLASS [62] and Monte Python [63] codes for the models considered in the present work. We used Metropolis Hastings algorithm with uniform priors on the model parameters to obtain correlated Markov Chain Monte Carlo samples by considering four combinations of data sets: CMB + BAO + JLA, CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0, CMB + BAO + JLA + GC, and CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC. The resulting samples are then analysed by using the GetDist Python package [64]. Note that we have chosen the minimal data set CMB+BAO+JLA because adding BAO + JLA data to CMB does not shift the regions of probability much, but this combination constrains the matter density very well, and reduces the error-bars on the parameters. The other data set combinations are considered to investigate how the constraints on various free parameters and derived parameters are affected by the inclusion/exclusion of the CC + H_0 and GC data. The final numerical/statistical results are summarized in Table I.

A. Analysis of constraints on νIVCDM model

The second column of Table I shows the constraints (mean values with 1σ errors) on the free parameters, and two derived parameters H_0 and σ_8 of the νIVCDM model from the four different combinations of data sets as mentioned in the caption of the table. In contrast, the third column of Table I shows the results for the $\nu\Lambda$CDM model.

Figure 1 shows the one-dimensional marginalized distribution, and 68% and 95% CL regions for some selected parameters $N_{\rm eff}$, H_0, σ_8 and δ pertaining to the νIVCDM model from the four combinations of data sets as shown in the legend of the figure. We do not find evidence of interaction in the dark sector from the minimal CMB + BAO + JLA data set since the probability region of δ finds close symmetry about 0. But the addition of $CC + H_0$ data to CMB + JLA + BAO data shifts the probability region of δ significantly, and we find $\delta \neq 0$ at more than 95% CL. On the other hand, the inclusion of GC data to the CMB + JLA + BAO data yields non-zero δ at 99% CL in the range $-0.060 \leq \delta \leq -0.250$. Also, the combined data set CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC puts δ in the range $-0.079 \leq \delta \leq -0.266$ at 99% CL. This shows a strong evidence of interaction in the dark sector within the framework of the νIVCDM model under consideration. Also, we notice from our results that $\delta < 0$, which in turn implies that the DM decays into vacuum energy. Similar results are reported in [14] for the late-time interaction in the dark sector, but from another observational perspective where the authors considered different redshift bins for the constraints.

Further, we notice a negative correlation of the coupling parameter δ with H_0, but a strong positive correlation with σ_8 in all the four combinations of data sets. Consequently, larger values of H_0 and smaller values of σ_8 correspond to non-zero and negative values of δ with larger departure from 0. We do not see any correlation of δ with $N_{\rm eff}$. But we find a strong positive correlation between $N_{\rm eff}$ and H_0, indicating that larger values of $N_{\rm eff}$ would correspond to larger values of H_0. Therefore, extra species of neutrinos would result into larger values of H_0. We note that the constraints from CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC data set yield $N_{\rm eff} < 3.57$ and $\sum m_\nu < 0.31$ eV at 99% CL.

B. Analysis of constraints on ν_sIVCDM model

As a generalization of the νIVCDM model, it is natural to investigate the cosmological consequences with sterile neutrinos, i.e., we study the ν_sIVCDM model, the (3+1) model as described in section III. Since $N_{\rm eff} < 3.57$ and $\delta \neq 0$ at 99% CL from CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC data in the νIVCDM model, it would be interesting to investigate the correlation of the mass m_{ν_s} of sterile neutrino with δ, and the other baseline parameters of the ν_sIVCDM model. The third and fourth columns of Table

TABLE I: Constraints on the free parameters, and two derived parameters H_0 and σ_8 of the νIVCDM, $\nu\Lambda$CDM, ν_sIVCDM and $\nu_s\Lambda$CDM models. For each parameter, the four entries (mean values with 1σ errors) are the constraints from the data combinations CMB + BAO + JLA, CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0, CMB + BAO + JLA + GC and CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC, respectively. The parameter H_0 is in the units of km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, while $\sum m_\nu$ and m_{ν_s} are in the units of eV. The $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ values of the fit are also displayed.

	νIVCDM	$\nu\Lambda$CDM	ν_sIVCDM	$\nu_s\Lambda$CDM
$10^2\omega_{\rm b}$	2.230 ± 0.021	2.238 ± 0.019	2.314 ± 0.014	2.311 ± 0.016
	2.245 ± 0.019	2.258 ± 0.017	2.309 ± 0.015	2.307 ± 0.014
	2.224 ± 0.020	2.241 ± 0.021	2.307 ± 0.015	2.326 ± 0.015
	2.240 ± 0.017	2.271 ± 0.018	2.303 ± 0.015	2.327 ± 0.014
$\omega_{\rm cdm}$	0.1182 ± 0.0028	$0.1188^{+0.0028}_{-0.0031}$	0.1322 ± 0.0013	0.1326 ± 0.0015
	0.1213 ± 0.0025	0.1214 ± 0.0026	0.1325 ± 0.0014	0.1325 ± 0.0014
	0.1181 ± 0.0028	0.1149 ± 0.0030	0.1325 ± 0.0015	0.1290 ± 0.0011
	0.1208 ± 0.0025	0.1189 ± 0.0026	0.1326 ± 0.0015	0.1287 ± 0.0012
$100\theta_s$	1.04200 ± 0.00049	1.04185 ± 0.00049	1.04005 ± 0.00029	1.04000 ± 0.00030
	1.04152 ± 0.00043	1.04144 ± 0.00044	1.04005 ± 0.00027	1.04001 ± 0.00029
	1.04200 ± 0.00049	1.04221 ± 0.00053	1.04002 ± 0.00032	1.04032 ± 0.00028
	1.04161 ± 0.00043	1.04156 ± 0.00045	1.04002 ± 0.00030	1.04027 ± 0.00029
$\ln 10^{10} A_s$	$3.091^{+0.027}_{-0.030}$	3.091 ± 0.026	3.149 ± 0.029	3.158 ± 0.032
	3.105 ± 0.028	3.104 ± 0.026	3.160 ± 0.033	3.164 ± 0.032
	$3.089^{+0.025}_{-0.030}$	$3.076^{+0.034}_{-0.038}$	3.186 ± 0.028	3.193 ± 0.028
	$3.103^{+0.025}_{-0.030}$	3.100 ± 0.035	3.185 ± 0.029	3.194 ± 0.029
n_s	0.9667 ± 0.0082	0.9703 ± 0.0080	1.0050 ± 0.0043	1.0040 ± 0.0043
	0.9731 ± 0.0074	0.9783 ± 0.0062	1.0040 ± 0.0043	1.0036 ± 0.0045
	0.9640 ± 0.0074	0.9680 ± 0.0087	1.0021 ± 0.0043	1.0070 ± 0.0041
	0.9709 ± 0.0065	0.9810 ± 0.0073	1.0013 ± 0.0042	1.0077 ± 0.0041
$\tau_{\rm reio}$	0.080 ± 0.014	0.079 ± 0.013	0.094 ± 0.016	0.098 ± 0.017
	0.084 ± 0.014	0.083 ± 0.014	0.099 ± 0.018	$0.102^{+0.019}_{-0.016}$
	$0.079^{+0.013}_{-0.015}$	$0.077^{+0.016}_{-0.018}$	0.113 ± 0.015	0.120 ± 0.015
	$0.083^{+0.013}_{-0.015}$	0.084 ± 0.017	0.112 ± 0.016	0.120 ± 0.016
$N_{\rm eff}$	$3.03^{+0.17}_{-0.20}$	3.10 ± 0.19	4.046	4.046
	3.23 ± 0.16	3.30 ± 0.15	4.046	4.046
	$3.00^{+0.17}_{-0.18}$	2.97 ± 0.20	4.046	4.046
	3.18 ± 0.14	3.29 ± 0.18	4.046	4.046
$\sum m_\nu$, m_{ν_s}	$0.12^{+0.01}_{-0.06}$, 0	$0.11^{+0.01}_{-0.05}$, 0	0.06, $0.14^{+0.06}_{-0.11}$	0.06, $0.17^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$
	$0.13^{+0.02}_{-0.07}$, 0	$0.11^{+0.01}_{-0.05}$, 0	0.06, $0.22^{+0.11}_{-0.14}$	0.06, $0.23^{+0.10}_{-0.11}$
	$0.13^{+0.03}_{-0.07}$, 0	$0.23^{+0.08}_{-0.11}$, 0	$0.06,\ 0.37 \pm 0.11$	$0.06,\ 0.60 \pm 0.09$
	$0.13^{+0.02}_{-0.07}$, 0	$0.27^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$, 0	$0.06,\ 0.42 \pm 0.10$	$0.06,\ 0.59 \pm 0.09$
δ	$-0.064^{+0.110}_{-0.083}$	0	0.087 ± 0.068	0
	$-0.135^{+0.100}_{-0.093}$	0	$0.024^{+0.087}_{-0.079}$	0
	-0.160 ± 0.040	0	-0.148 ± 0.041	0
	-0.171 ± 0.036	0	-0.142 ± 0.042	0
H_0	68.20 ± 1.40	68.00 ± 1.20	72.30 ± 1.00	73.29 ± 0.75
	70.40 ± 1.10	69.50 ± 0.92	72.55 ± 0.96	72.77 ± 0.71
	69.00 ± 1.30	66.90 ± 1.10	$74.06^{+0.90}_{-1.00}$	71.58 ± 0.62
	70.50 ± 0.93	68.97 ± 0.90	73.47 ± 0.86	71.74 ± 0.63
σ_8	$0.791^{+0.035}_{-0.026}$	0.813 ± 0.013	$0.870^{+0.029}_{-0.025}$	0.841 ± 0.017
	0.779 ± 0.033	$0.823^{+0.013}_{-0.012}$	0.839 ± 0.035	0.830 ± 0.018
	0.761 ± 0.010	0.769 ± 0.011	0.767 ± 0.012	0.765 ± 0.011
	0.766 ± 0.010	0.777 ± 0.011	0.761 ± 0.011	0.766 ± 0.011
$\chi^2_{\rm min}/2$	6821.18	6821.63	6833.61	6833.82
	6831.55	6843.05	6844.90	6843.05
	6821.98	6831.07	6836.14	6841.75
	6831.34	6843.05	6846.11	6852.35



FIG. 1: *One-dimensional marginalized distribution, and 68% and 95% CL regions for some selected parameters of the νIVCDM model.*

I carry the constraints (mean values with 1σ errors) on the free parameters, and two derived parameters H_0 and σ_8 of the ν_sIVCDM model, and the companion $\nu_s\Lambda$CDM model respectively, from four different combinations of data sets as described in the caption of the table.

Figure 2 shows the one-dimensional marginalized distribution, and 68% and 95% CL regions for some selected parameters m_{ν_s}, H_0, σ_8 and δ pertaining to the ν_sIVCDM model from the four combinations of data sets as shown in the legend of the figure. We see that the data sets CMB + JLA + BAO and CMB + JLA + BAO + CC + H_0 do not provide any significant evidence of interaction in the dark sector of the ν_sIVCDM model. But the addition of GC data to the CMB + JLA + BAO data yields non-zero δ at 99% CL in the range $-0.05 \leq \delta \leq -0.24$. Also, the combined data set CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC puts δ in the range $-0.03 \leq \delta \leq -0.25$ at 99% CL. This shows a strong evidence of interaction in the dark sector within the framework of the ν_sIVCDM model, when the GC data in taken into account. Also, $\delta < 0$ implies the decay of DM into vacuum energy. Further, we observe negative correlation between δ and m_{ν_s} in case of the data sets CMB + JLA + BAO and CMB + JLA + BAO + CC + H_0, but the inclusion of GC data brings a positive correlation between the two parameters. The parameter δ exhibits negative correlation with H_0, but positive correlation with σ_8. Thus, the larger values of H_0 and smaller values of σ_8 would push the parameter δ (with negative values) away from 0. Likewise, correlations among the parameters m_{ν_s}, H_0, and σ_8 can be seen clearly from the Figure 2. From the joint analysis using the full data, we note that $m_{\nu_s} = 0.136^{+0.06}_{-0.11}$ at 1σ CL.

It is well known that the parameters describing neutrinos can exhibit degeneracy with the other cosmological parameters. In [65], the authors show that there is a strong degeneracy between the spectral index (n_s) and $N_{\rm eff}$. As discussed in [66, 67], the ΛCDM scenario with $n_s = 1$ and $\Delta N_{\rm eff} \approx 1$ can fit the Planck CMB data. In [68], the authors considered $N_{\rm eff} + \Lambda$CDM (with $n_s = 1$), and showed that the model can perfectly fit CMB data. Therefore, we can expect a correlation between the parameters $N_{\rm eff}$, n_s and H_0. The unusual high constraints on n_s observed in ν_sIVCDM model are surely due to the correlation between $N_{\rm eff}$ and n_s, which is related to the diffusion damping caused by $N_{\rm eff}$ at high multipoles, that requires $n_s \sim 1$ to compensate the suppression. On the other hand, the additional free parameters representing



FIG. 2: *One-dimensional marginalized distribution, and 68% and 95% CL regions for some selected parameters of the ν_sIVCDM model.*

physics beyond the ΛCDM model can also correlate with these parameters. Thus, the constraints on n_s also could be the outcome of that correlation. A detailed analysis of an extended parametric space for cosmological models besides ΛCDM scenario, including effects on inflation parameters, will be presented in a forthcoming paper [69].

C. Reconciliation of tensions on H_0 and σ_8

Assuming standard ΛCDM baseline, the Planck collaboration [31] measured $H_0 = 67.27 \pm 0.66$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1} that is about two standard deviations away from the locally measured value $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$ km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1} reported in [36]. Results from Planck collaboration have also revealed around 2σ level tension between CMB temperature and the Sunyaev-Zel'dovich cluster abundances measurements on σ_8 parameter, given by $\sigma_8 = 0.831 \pm 0.013$ [31] and $\sigma_8 = 0.75 \pm 0.03$ [70], respectively. Thus, the galaxy cluster measurements prefer lower values of σ_8. In [71], it has also been argued that interacting dark sector models can reconcile the present tension on σ_8. In the present study, we observed strong correlation of the coupling parameter δ with H_0 and σ_8, in both νIVCDM and ν_sIVCDM models such that the larger departure of negative δ values from 0 leads to larger values of H_0 and smaller values of σ_8. Also, we can see the correlations between the three parameters δ, H_0, and σ_8 with clarity in Figure 3, where the parametric space $\sigma_8 - \delta$ coloured by H_0 values is shown for the νIVCDM (left panel) and ν_sIVCDM (right panel) models. Having a note of these observations, we now proceed to examine whether these models can alleviate the current tensions on H_0 and σ_8.

Figure 4 shows 1D marginalized probability distributions of H_0 and σ_8 for νIVCDM (upper panel) and ν_sIVCDM (lower panel) models. From the plot in upper left panel, we notice that the tension on H_0 is reconciled marginally in the νIVCDM model, especially when the constraints are considered by including CC + H_0 data. The plot in upper right panel shows that tension on σ_8 is reconciled perfectly in the νIVCDM model when the GC data is taken into account for the constraints. See the constraints on H_0 and σ_8 in second column of Table I. From the plot in lower left panel, we notice that the tension on H_0 is reconciled in ν_sIVCDM model when constrained with any of the four data combinations under consideration. This is due to the positive correlation be-



FIG. 3: *Constraints on $\sigma_8 - \delta$ parametric space coloured by H_0 values for the νIVCDM (left panel) and ν_sIVCDM (right panel) models from CMB + BAO + JLA + CC + H_0 + GC data.*



FIG. 4: *1D marginalized probability distributions of H_0 and σ_8 for νIVCDM (upper panel) and ν_sIVCDM (lower panel) models. The vertical gray band in left panels corresponds to $H_0 = 73.24 \pm 1.74$ km s^{-1}Mpc [36] while in right panels it corresponds to $\sigma_8 = 0.75 \pm 0.03$ [70]. CBJ stands for CMB + BAO + JLA.*

tween $N_{\rm eff}$ and H_0. On the other hand, the tension on σ_8 is reconciled in ν_sIVCDM model when it is constrained by including the GC data (see the plot in the lower right panel of Figure 4). Thus, the ν_sIVCDM model can alleviate the tensions on both the parameters H_0 and σ_8, with the coupling parameter $\delta \neq 0$ at 99% CL. A detailed and clear exposition of all the values of these parameters in ν_sIVCDM model, from all the four data combinations, can be seen in the third column of table I.

It is usual in the literature to reconcile both the tensions by assuming an extended parametric space of ΛCDM model. The authors in [6] argue that the tension must be resolved by considering systematics effects on important data, or by new physics beyond the introduction of massive (active or sterile) neutrinos. Here we have demonstrated the reconciliation of both the tensions, while observing the signs of a new physics, viz., the coupling parameter of the dark sector is non-zero up to 99% CL.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, we have shown how an extended parametric space with massive neutrinos can influence the observational constraints on a coupling between DM and DE, where DE is characterized by a cosmological constant, i.e., an interacting vacuum energy scenario.

Considering two neutrino scenarios via νIVCDM and ν_sIVCDM models, we have found that the inclusion of CC + H_0 and GC data to the CMB + BAO + JLA data considerably improves the observational constraints in favor of an interaction in the dark sector. In particular, both the models yield the coupling parameter $\delta < 0$ at 99% CL when constrained by including the GC data. So we conclude that the GC data enforces almost a certain interaction in the dark sector where the DM decays into vacuum energy, within the framework of each of the two models under consideration. We have demonstrated how the coupling parameter δ correlates with other parameters, and how the current tensions on the parameters H_0 and σ_8 can be reconciled in the two models.

Recent anomalies in neutrino experiments can be explained by neutrino oscillations if the standard three-neutrino mixing is extended with the addition of light sterile neutrinos, which can give us important information on the new physics beyond the standard model. In the present study, we have studied the so-called (3 + 1) neutrinos model, i.e., the ν_sIVCDM model, and also we have found an evidence for a coupling between DM and DE at 99% CL. If future neutrino experiments confirm the existence of light sterile neutrinos, this may lead to a possible evidence for a non-minimal coupling between the dark components on cosmological scales. Future and more accurate measurements from important cosmological sources, in particular large scale structure and CMB, and of neutrino properties including mass hierarchy, effective number of species, as well as the sum of the active neutrino masses, can shed light on the possible interaction in the dark sector.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank S. Gariazzo, E. D. Valentino, J. Alcaniz, and S. Pan for useful comments. S.K. gratefully acknowledges the support from SERB-DST project No. EMR/2016/000258.

[1] A. G. Reiss et al., Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998). [arXiv:9805201]
[2] S. J. Perlmutter et al., Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999). [arXiv:9812133]
[3] R. A. Battye, T. Charnock and A. Moss, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 103508 (2015). [arXiv:1409.2769]
[4] G. E. Addison et al., Astrophys. J. **818**, 132 (2016). [arXiv:1511.00055]
[5] J. L. Bernal, L. Verde and A. G. Riess, JCAP **1610**, 019 (2016). [arXiv:1607.05617]
[6] B. Leistedt, H. V. Peiris, and L. Verde, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 041301 (2014). [arXiv:1404.5950]
[7] J. W. Hu, R. G. Cai, Z. K. Guo, and B. Hu, JCAP **1405**, 020 (2014). [arXiv:1401.0717]
[8] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).
[9] T. Padamanbhan, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, L167 (2002). [arXiv:0204020]
[10] T. Padamanbhan, Phys. Rep. **380**, 235 (2003). [arXiv:0212290]
[11] R. Bousso, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **40**, 607 (2008). [arXiv:0708.4231]
[12] Yu. L. Bolotin, A. Kostenko, O. A. Lemets, and D.A. Yerokhin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **24**, 1530007 (2015). [arXiv:1310.0085]
[13] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavón, Rep. Prog. Phys. **79**, 096901 (2016). [arXiv:1603.08299]
[14] V. Salvatelli, N. Said, M. Bruni, A. Melchiorri, and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 181301 (2014). [arXiv:1406.7297]
[15] J. Sola, A. G. Valent and J. C. Perez, Astrophys. J. Lett. **811**, L14 (2015). [arXiv:1506.05793]
[16] J. Sola, A. G. Valent and J. C. Perez, arXiv:1602.02103.
[17] C. Pigozzo et al., JCAP **1605**, 022 (2016). [arXiv:1510.01794]
[18] M. G. Richarte, and L. Xu, arXiv:1506.02518.
[19] J. Väliviita, and E. Palmgren, JCAP **1507**, 015 (2015). [arXiv:1504.02464]
[20] E. G. M. Ferreira et al., arXiv:1412.2777.
[21] R. Murgia, S. Gariazzo, and N. Fornengo, JCAP **1604**, 014 (2016). [arXiv:1602.01765]
[22] M. C. G. Garcia and M. Maltoni, Phys. Rept. **460** , 1 (2008). [arXiv:0704.1800]
[23] M. C. G. Garcia, M. Maltoni, and T. Schwetz, Nucl. Phys. B **908**, 199 (2016). [arXiv:1512.06856]
[24] F. Capozzi, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, D. Montanino, and A. Palazzo, Nucl. Phys. B **908**, 218 (2016). [arXiv:1601.07777]
[25] A. Palazzo, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **28**, 1330004 (2013). [arXiv:1302.1102].
[26] K. N. Abazajian et al., arXiv:1204.5379.
[27] S. Gariazzo et al., J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **43**, 033001 (2016). [arXiv:1507.08204]
[28] A. D. Dolgov, Phys. Rept. **370**, 333 (2002). [arXiv:0202122]
[29] J. Lesgourgues, and S. Pastor, Phys. Rept. **429**, 307 (2006). [arXiv:0603494]
[30] J. Lesgourgues and S. Pastor, New Journal of Physics **16**, 065002 (2014). [arXiv:1404.1740]
[31] P. A. R. Ade et al., A & A **594**, A13 (2016). [arXiv:1502.01589]
[32] E. D. Valentino et al., arXiv:1612.00021.
[33] E. D. Valentino and L. M. Houghton, arXiv:1612.08334.
[34] J. L. Bernal, L. Verde, and A. G. Riess, JCAP **10**, 019 (2016). [arXiv:1607.05617]
[35] M. Wyman, D. H. Rudd, R. A. Vanderveld, and W. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 051302 (2014). [arXiv:1307.7715]
[36] Adam G. Riess et al., ApJ **826**, 56 (2016). [arXiv:1604.01424]
[37] T. Tram, R. Vallance, and V. Vennin, JCAP **01**, 046 (2017). [arXiv:1606.09199]
[38] J. F. Zhang, Y. H. Li, and X. Zhang, Phys. Lett. B **739**, 102 (2014). [arXiv:1408.4603]
[39] T. Bringmann, J. Hasenkamp, and J. Kersten, JCAP **1407**, 042 (2014). [arXiv:1312.4947]

[40] P. Ko and Y. Tang, Phys. Lett. B **739**, 62 (2014). [arXiv:1404.0236]

[41] X. Chu, B. Dasgupta, J. Kopp, JCAP **1510**, 011 (2015). [arXiv:1505.02795]

[42] Maria Archidiacono et al., JCAP **08**, 067 (2016). [arXiv:1606.07673]

[43] Elena Giusarm et al., Phys. Rev. D **83**, 115023 (2011). [arXiv:1102.4774]

[44] W. Yang, H. Li, Y. Wu, and J. Lu, JCAP **10**, 007 (2016). [arXiv:1608.07039]

[45] F. E. M. Costa, E. M. Barboza, Jr. and J. S. Alcaniz, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 127302 (2009). [arXiv:0905.0672]

[46] P. C. Ferreira, J. C. Carvalho, and J. S. Alcaniz, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 087301 (2013). [arXiv:1212.2492]

[47] R. C. Nunes, S. Pan, and E. N. Saridakis, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 023508 (2016). [arXiv:1503.04113]

[48] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 123511 (2016). [arXiv:1608.02454]

[49] J. H. He, B. Wang and E. Abdalla, Phys. Lett. B **671**, 139 (2009). [arXiv:0807.3471]

[50] Y. Wang et al., Phys. Rev. D **87**, 083503 (2013). [arXiv:1301.5315]

[51] D. Wands, J. D. Santiago and Y. Wang, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 145017 (2012). [arXiv:1203.6776]

[52] C. P. Ma, and E. Bertschinger, Astrophys. J. **7**, 455 (1995). [arXiv:9506072]

[53] Planck collaboration: P. A. R. Ade et al., A & A **594**, A13 (2016). [arXiv:1502.01589]

[54] F. Beutler et al., MNRAS **416**, 3017 (2011). [arXiv:1106.3366]

[55] A. J. Ross et al., MNRAS **449**, 835 (2015). [arXiv:1409.3242]

[56] L. Anderson et al., MNRAS **441**, 24 (2014). [arXiv:1312.4877]

[57] A. Font-Ribera, et al., JCAP **5**, 27 (2014). [arXiv:1311.1767]

[58] M. Betoule et al., (SDSS collaboration), Astron. Astrophys. **568**, A22 (2014). [arXiv:1401.4064]

[59] M. Moresco et al., JCAP **12**, 039 (2016). [arXiv:1604.00183]

[60] Planck collaboration: P. A. R. Ade et al., A & A **594**, A24 (2016). [arXiv:1502.01597]

[61] C. Heymans et al., MNRAS **432**, 2433 (2013). [arXiv:1303.1808]

[62] D. Blas, J. Lesgourgues, and T. Tram, JCAP **07**, 034 (2011). [arXiv:1104.2933]

[63] B. Audren, J. Lesgourgues, K. Benabed and S. Prunet, JCAP **02**, 001 (2013). [arXiv:1210.7183]

[64] https://github.com/cmbant/getdist

[65] H. Li, J. Q. Xia, and X. Zhang, Phys. Dark Univ. **2**, 188 (2013). [arXiv:1303.3428]

[66] Planck collaboration: P. A. R. Ade et al., A & A **594**, A20 (2016). [arXiv:1502.02114]

[67] Planck collaboration: P. A. R. Ade et al., Astron. Astrophys. **571**, A22 (2014). [arXiv:1303.5082]

[68] Licia Verde et al., JCAP **09**, 013 (2013). [arXiv:1307.2904]

[69] S. Kumar and R. C. Nunes, [In prep.].

[70] Planck collaboration: P. A. R. Ade et al. A & A **571**, A20 (2014). [arXiv:1303.5080]

[71] A. Pourtsidou and T. Tram, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 043518 (2016). [arXiv:1604.04222]